

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Public Hearing for Section 10 Permits 4477305 and
4427402 at Gary, Indiana, Oct. 23, 1974

TO : File

FROM : Ronald L. Mustard

The writer attended the Public Hearing concerning the above subject and has the following comments to make:

Col. Miller opened the hearing by giving the background information concerning both the South Works and Gary Works projects and showing slides of both areas.

The Public Notices were read detailing the work to be accomplished and the correspondence leading to the decision by the Corps of Engineers to hold a Public Hearing.

It was the Corps of Engineers' understanding, at this time, that a NPDES permit would be required, but they would be contacting EPA to make a final determination as there appeared to be different opinions from EPA.

Written testimony was given by the following people representing the listed company or organization with some of the comments made. Col. Miller stated he would send EPA copies of all written testimony.

1. U. S. Steel - Kenneth A. Brown

He stated the company could dredge hydraulically at the Gary Works, but clam shell operation would have to be used at South Works because of having to haul the dredged material to the Gary disposal site.

Mr. Brown stated that the disposal site of 200 acres would hold 3.5 million cubic yards of material. The expected volume of material to be dredged would only take 7 percent this capacity.

The retention time for the disposal site would be 75 days for the material hauled in from South Works and dumped, and many times this for the material pumped in from the Gary location.

Mr. Brown advised that a 960' x 600' cell has been built inside the existing disposal site. It is estimated that this area would hold 200 to 300,00 cubic yards below the water level. This could possibly hold the total expected volume of dredged material which is 180,000 cubic yards from the South Works, and 60,000 cubic yards from the Gary Works. (Total: 240,000 cubic yards).

Subj: Public Hearing..... Oct. 23, 1974

2. State of Illinois - Attorney William J. Scott represented by Jeffrey S. Herden

He stated U. S. Steel would need a permit from the Illinois Department of Transportation with concurrence from the Ill. EPA for any work activity in Lake Michigan.

He indicated that there were some fees associated with placing fill material in the South Works area (10 cents per cubic yard?) payable to the State of Illinois.

Col. Miller advised that all Federal, State and local permits and conditions would be met by the company before the Corps of Engineers would issue a permit.

3. Lake Michigan Federation - Arnold Leider

Copy of his comments are attached.

4. Lake Michigan Fish and Game Protection Association -

John Macinac

Advised he wanted to be assured that the U. S. Steel operation would not be handled, or cause the same problems that the Inland Steel project of 1972 did.

He wanted to know the types of barges to be used.

The enclosed disposal area has four (4) submerged pipes to obtain Lake level. Pollutants could get out into the Lake through these pipes.

He questioned the credibility of U. S. Steel as to whether they would report the true readings from the samples, and if they would shut down their operations if permit conditions were not being met.

5. Great Lakes Chapter Sierra Club - Ann Fisher

Indicated they did not want U. S. Steel to request an approval at a later date for extension of land into the Lake from this filled area any time in the future.

They request the bulkhead be raised 7' or more.

Subj: Public Hearing..... Oct. 23, 1974

They would like to see the overflow pipes equipped with some kind of filters.

Requested that U.S. EPA determine if dredged material is polluted.

6. Lake Michigan Inter-League Group - Mrs. Gruenfelder

Feel one EIS is definitely needed, and if a permit is issued, want it clearly spelled out from start to finish what will be accomplished by the Company to assure that minimal harm will be done to the environment.

7. Business Man for the Peoples Interest (BPI) -

David Dinsmore Comey

Most of his comments were covered by the previous speakers. Felt that an EIS is definitely needed.

Pointed out to Col. Miller that the term person- does include organization, club, etc. as most of the groups are, which were represented.

He indicated no regulations that the Corps of Engineers had covered having a Public Hearing. They have not been finalized by the Corps of Engineers yet.

Requested that an additional 7' be built all the way around on the diked area.

Pointed out that monitoring was to be done on a monthly basis, but the Gary Works job would be done in three weeks.

Felt that an NPDES would be needed for discharge.

The following comments were made during the open questioning period:

(1) Col. Miller advised that he did not think this was a major Federal action having a significant effect on the environment at this time. So, he felt an EIS was not needed.

Subj: Public Hearing..... Oct. 23, 1974

(2) Col. Miller advised he would check with EPA to see if a NPDES permit is needed. Seemed to be a difference of opinion within EPA.

(3) U.S. Steel sees no need for a filter on the outfall pipes, thus did not consider any.

(4) A permit from the Chicago Planning Commission has been filed for by U. S. Steel Co.

(5) Mr. Comey (BPI) wanted to know what appropriate actions would be taken by the Corps of Engineers when U. S. Steel was not meeting its permit conditions. How will the Corps of Engineers supervise and/or monitor the operations?

(6) Col. Miller advised there would not be anyone from his office living on site 24 hours per day.

(7) Col. Miller closed the meeting by advising that all questions asked would be given proper response.

Col. Miller advised the writer that he would have a complete package of all correspondence from this Public Hearing sent to EPA - Federal Activities Branch.

Ronald L. Mustard